

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

None of the claims are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 6-23 are currently pending and under consideration.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 6-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER THOMPSON ET AL. (US 5,809,433) IN VIEW OF RUDISILL ET AL. (US 6,272,324)**

The present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to an input device comprising an antenna arranged at an upper surface inside said housing, and which is detachable from the case. The housing has a first detachable upper cover that is swappable with a second detachable upper cover.

Thompson et al. ("Thompson") discloses a radio communication device, which includes a keypad cover antenna 107 (see FIG. 7) connected to a transmission line 517. Thompson also provides a transceiver circuitry 515 (FIG. 4), which is connected to an elastomeric connector 516 that connects to a flex conductor, or transmission line, 517. The transmission line 517 extends into a hinge assembly 518.

The Examiner concedes that Thompson fails to disclose a detachable upper cover and a detachable antenna.

Rudisill et al. ("Rudisill") discloses an electrical connector, which establishes electrical connection between transceiver electronics disposed in a main body 12 of a telephone and remote electrical components contained in a movable cover 14.

However, Rudisill fails to provide a cover that is "swappable" with a second detachable cover. The Examiner relies on various portions of the Rudisill reference regarding the claimed "swappable" feature (see column 1, lines 47-58, column 4, lines 5-34, column 5, lines 31-68, and column 6, lines 1-49 of Rudisill), which does not disclose or suggest a swappable cover. According to column 1, lines 47-58, for example, Rudisill merely discloses that it is desirable to design a flip that can be "detached and reattached" from the main body. Nothing in Rudisill discloses that the cover 14 is swappable with a second cover, like the claimed present invention

which provides a first detachable upper cover that is swappable with a second detachable upper cover.

Therefore, Thompson and Rudisill, either alone or combination, does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Thompson and Rudisill because the antenna 107 arranged in the second housing portion (cover) 103 of Thompson is connected to the transceiver circuitry 515 mounted in the main body 101, making it impossible to take the cover 103 of Thompson off and exchange with another cover.

Similar to claim 1, claims 11, 20, and 23 also provides the feature in which the first detachable cover is swappable with a second detachable upper cover. Therefore, claims 11, 20, and 23 also distinguish over Thompson and Rudisill.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 6-10, and 14-16 (depending from claim 1), 12, 13, and 17-19 (depending from claim 11), and 21 and 22 (depending from claim 20) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1, 11, and 20.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 6-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER YING ET AL. (US 6,442,400) IN VIEW OF RUDISILL ET AL. (US 6,272,324)**

Ying et al. ("Ying") discloses a portable electronic communication device with a dual band antenna system. Ying describes a printed antenna 40, which is connected to radio circuitry inside a housing 12 (see column 3, lines 48-53) and comprises antenna portions 42 and 44 that are electrically connected to each other and to the radio circuitry inside the housing 12 through an opening 45 in the flip 14 (see column 4, lines 30-35).

The Examiner concedes that Ying fails to disclose a detachable upper cover. However, Ying also fails to disclose an antenna that is detachable from the housing 12 because Ying clearly describes that the antenna portions 42 and 44 are electrically connected to each other and to the radio circuitry inside the housing 12 through the opening 45 in the flip 14.

By contrast, the claimed present invention provides an antenna that is detachable from a case along with each of the detachable upper covers (see claim 1 of the present invention).

As argued in section II above, Rudisill discloses that it is desirable to design a flip that can be "detached and reattached" from the main body, but fails to disclose that the cover 14 is

swappable with a second cover, like the claimed present invention which provides a first detachable upper cover that is swappable with a second detachable upper cover.

Therefore, Ying and Rudisill, either alone or combination, does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ying and Rudisill because the antenna portions 42 and 44 of Ying are electrically connected to each other and to the radio circuitry inside the housing 12 through the opening 45 in the flip 14, making it impossible to detach the antenna portions 42 and 44 along with detachable covers.

Independent claims 11, 20, and 23 recite similar features as claim 1 and distinguish over Ying and Rudisill for the same reasons argued above.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 6-10, and 14-16 (depending from claim 1), 12, 13, and 17-19 (depending from claim 11), and 21 and 22 (depending from claim 20) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1, 11, and 20.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-6-06

By: Derrick L. Fields  
Derrick L. Fields  
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501